

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Travis Heath King,)	
Plaintiff,)	C.A. No.: 6:11-cv-02833-RBH
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
Tavcia L. James, McCormick CI Medical)	
Quarters,)	
Defendant.)	

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, brought this suit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Neither party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation.¹ In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is

ORDERED that the Complaint is dismissed *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process.

¹ While Plaintiff has failed to file any objections to the Report and Recommendation, the court does note that it received a letter from Plaintiff on November 29, 2011, in which he inquired about the status of his case. *See* Letter [Docket Entry 13]. Plaintiff signed and dated that Letter only one (1) day after the court placed in the mail to Plaintiff a copy of the Report and Recommendation. *See id.* at 1 (date of “Nov-22-2011”). In response to that Letter, the clerk’s office mailed to Plaintiff a copy of the docket in this case. *See* [Docket Entry 14]. Upon review, the court now notes that nowhere in his Letter did Plaintiff object to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, nor did he request more time in which to do so. Moreover, at no point since the court mailed the copy of the docket to Plaintiff has he objected to the Report and Recommendation or requested more time to do so.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina
December 20, 2011